

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This paper is submitted responsive to the office action mailed March 25, 2008. Reconsideration of the application in light of the accompanying remarks is respectfully requested.

In the last action, the Examiner made final a rejection of independent claims 1 and 7 as anticipated by US 6,453,356 to Sheard (hereafter Sheard).

As summarized in previous arguments, claims 1 and 7 each call for a plurality of installation-local units and a plurality of additional units. The plurality of installation-local units includes a corresponding plurality of installations communicating in different formats, and the installation-local units each contain a formatter for formatting the real time data received from the installations into universal data.

The plurality of additional units are all configured for receiving this same universal data, and then for converting the data to the appropriate format for a user-application, with a plurality of user-applications being called for which use the information in different protocols.

The Examiner has suggested that Figure 1 of Sheard anticipates this claim, and discusses the adaptors and applications shown in Figure 1. What is not shown in Figure 1, to the best understanding of the undersigned, is a plurality of additional units designed to receive the universal data and then transform this data into proper protocol for different user-applications. Figure 1 shows a single data exchange engine which receives information in various different formats from adaptors 34a-b.

In addressing the portion of the claim directed to the additional units, the Examiner has continued to refer to the same systems 2, 3, etc. that he also considered to be the installations. It is submitted that claim 1 calls at least for the situation where

the user-application is different from an installation. In addition, even if this is the case, universal data does not transfer directly between any of applications 1-4 as shown in Figure 1 in a universal format. Rather, this information is stored from each application at data exchange engine 32. Avoidance of this data exchange engine 32 is precisely the goal of the present invention, and it is again submitted that Sheard fails to disclose or suggest the invention as claimed.

Dependent claims 2, 4-6, 8 and 10-14 all depend directly or indirectly from one of the above-identified claims and are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance based upon this dependency and the arguments set forth above. Each of these claims is submitted to be allowable as well.

It is believed that no fee is due in connection with this paper. If any such fee is due, please charge same to Deposit Account Number 02-0184.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel De Sousa et al.

By /george a. coury/
George A. Coury
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 34,309
Tel: (203) 777-6628
Fax: (203) 865-0297

Date: June 25, 2008